LUND UNIVERSITY

Bibliofil: a Tool that Facilitates Parallel Publishing

Hultman Özek, Yvonne; Clark, Aprile

Published in:
ScieCom Info

2011

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Hultman Özek, Y., & Clark, A. (2011). Bibliofil: a Tool that Facilitates Parallel Publishing. *ScieCom Info*, *7*(1).

Total number of authors:
2

General rights
Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.
• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

sciecominfo
Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

BIBLIOFIL: A TOOL THAT FACILITATES PARALLEL PUBLISHING

Yvonne Hultman Özek, Aprile Clark

Since 2002, the Library & ICT Unit at the Faculty of Medicine, Lund University, has been assigned to support researchers in the scientific communication process at the faculty. One of the services offered to authors in this context is aimed at making their final products—articles that have been accepted, peer reviewed, and published by any journal—available through open access on the Internet. Implementation of the Bibliofil tool has facilitated the work that is done by the library staff in this process.

Yvonne Hultman Özek, Senior Librarian
Aprile Clark, Librarian

(Bo Nilsson, IT engineer, is acknowledged for contributing his technical knowledge to the project.)

Faculty of Medicine, Library & ICT Unit, Lund University Sweden

Introduction

Lund University Publications (LUP) is a database that serves as the repository for all research outputs produced at thIS university. At the Faculty of Medicine, LUP is the platform used to manage the work process in this context, which ranges from communicating with the authors to adding the published articles to the database for open access (OA) on the Internet. In addition, the *Lund Medical Faculty Monthly* (LMFM), which is the showcase for articles written by members of the Faculty of Medicine (Hultman Özek, 2005; Eriksson, 2005), takes advantage of the parallel publishing by collecting data from LUP on a monthly basis, thus intensifying the visibility of the article production at this institution. The selection of the LMFM *Article of the Month* has become a value-added post-publication event, which in turn also encourages authors to strive for open access publishing.
Information and awareness about the support we provide to researchers and doctoral students is spread not only via our home page, but also through education in PhD courses, communication with research groups, and close collaboration with the faculty's Information and Communication Unit.

Background

Since 2002, all articles published in OA journals (under creative common license) have been added to the LUP repository and are thus also available in LMFM. In 2005, we implemented a new routine for parallel publishing as a second step towards increasing the content of the repository and LMFM. Besides trying to address the copyright issues, this required involvement of the authors in aspects such as the following: extensive communication via email, obtaining full texts, and adjustment of the documents according to the publishers' requirements. All of this was very interesting for us to learn from the author's perspective, but it was also extremely time consuming. We concluded that it is not advisable to expect authors to handle the parallel publishing themselves, because that adds yet another complicated task to their workload. Thus, that experience supports our approach, which is to facilitate OA publishing as much as possible for the authors. We also observed that our strategy agrees completely with the results of previous studies showing that the core activities of researchers are to read, write, publish, share data, and stay updated in their respective fields (Foster & Gibbons, 2005; Salo, 2008). Nevertheless, in continuation we considered how we could use IT solutions to facilitate the workflow in parallel publishing without losing our personal communication with the individual authors and at the same time continuing to build knowledge on various publishing issues.

The project

To identify what aspects of the workflow needed to be more effective, we asked our IT engineer to participate and initiated a project to develop a useful tool. We knew that many of the functions that were required were already existent and running in other systems. Thus, it was first necessary to give our IT engineer a detailed explanation of what ideally could be rationalized, and thereafter we had to work together to identify what could be reused to meet our needs throughout the parallel publishing work process—from contact with authors to adding the final article to the LUP database.
The project resulted in the tool we call Bibliofil, which has three functions that render the same number of steps of the work process more effective. Bibliofil eliminates the most time-consuming manual tasks by semi-automatically communicating with associated databases. The first function involves establishing an author's affiliation and presenting it hierarchically within the organizational structure, which greatly

facilitates the previously manual entry editing. The second function achieves effective communication with the authors. If the publisher permits parallel publishing of the author's final version, it must be obtained from the author. By entering the LUP entry number in Bibliofil, an e-mail template is presented that contains e-mail addresses to authors affiliated with Lund University, bibliographic data, and any additional information required. The template can be edited before it is sent. The third and last function assists in the production of a cover page containing all information required by the publisher; this resembles the second function in that a template with the accurate information is presented, but it is turned into a PDF.

Current workflow

Bibliofil has indeed dramatically reduced our workload, but we would also like to emphasize the importance of awareness when delegating routine tasks to temporary staff. For effective use of time, temporary employees are assigned the jobs of editing the bibliographic entries in LUP and identifying departmental affiliation of authors. This gives the professional librarians more time to focus on communication with the authors.

Some facets of the remaining work that has to be done are also routine in nature and do not require professional skills. However, these aspects are still of value for the professional librarian and are closely connected with the next step in the process, namely, sending standardized e-mails and making PDFs, which are clearly simple tasks but nonetheless involve *communication* with the researchers that is essential for those individuals themselves as well as for the librarian. The author–librarian communication is necessary for continued reflection on the workflow, and it is also highly valuable in providing knowledge about the authors' situation, publishing structures, and complications. Thus, the task stays with the professional librarian and creates continuity in the Library and ICT organization. Moreover, it is important that the knowledge gained remains in our organization as part of the culture of communicating and integrating with the research environment. Therefore, delegating routine tasks to temporary staff should be restricted in order to maintain an understanding of the context in which publishing problems occur.

Articles that are already freely available online are added to the LUP repository without asking permission from the authors, because it is assumed that additional dissemination is generally desirable. At present, about 30% of the entries in LMFM include full texts, both OA publishers´ versions and authors' final manuscripts. The Sherpa Romeo database is the main tool used to determine what publications can be added to LUP. Many publishers' copyright policies are available in Romeo, but unfortunately such information is limited for some publishers and not available at all for others, which restricts the number of articles published in LUP—perhaps unnecessarily. A more complete coverage would certainly increase the number of full texts in LUP.

The response rate among the researchers we contact is roughly 50%, and, with few exceptions, those who do respond gratefully accept the service offered by the Library & ICT Unit. This results in many questions about publishing and copyright issues, which concern everything from copyright problems associated with trying to include a published article in a dissertation, to technical problems that occur while converting a graph into a different file format. Some researchers forestall the library's workflow and send their final manuscripts spontaneously! Inasmuch as this signifies a positive attitude towards OA and parallel publishing, these contributions are gladly received by the librarian team, even though doing so creates some additional work, since it is not part of routine procedures.

Conclusion

This model entails using the institutional repository, keeping track of publications, and systematically inviting researchers to send their manuscripts, and, on the part of the researchers, it saves time and effort, and also provides support for handling copyright issues and technical matters. This agrees with results obtained by Foster and Gibbons (2005) in a study of faculty members' needs with regard to authoring, archiving, and disseminating their work. Those investigators found that, among other things, the primary aspirations of faculty were to be able to do the following: make their own work readily available; easily access other people's work; keep up to date in their field of research; avoid violating copyright issues; not increase their workload. Furthermore, Grundmann (2009) has asserted that voluntary faculty deposits in institutional repositories remain low due to the misconception that this is a complicated and time-consuming process, and because there is concern over copyright issues. The service provided by the Library & ICT Unit relieves researchers of these problems and also increases the full-text content of the LUP repository. It is important to take the researchers' workflow into consideration and not to expect these individuals to take their own initiative and use their own time to archive their work in the institutional repository, as Salo (2008) has suggested is the case. Salo identified active collecting of content, along with a systematic approach, as one of the key requirements of a successful repository.

Although the success of this workflow model is encouraging, there is always room for improvement.

Streamlining the librarians' workflow by implementing the IT solution Bibliofil can free valuable time from routine tasks so that it can be used more constructively to solve problems together with the authors.

Time spent acquiring new knowledge and immersing ourselves in the world of journals and publishers allows us to respond to the researchers' needs with confidence.

References

Hultman Özek, Yvonne (2005) Lund Virtual Medical Journal Makes Self-Archiving Attractive and Easy for Authors. *D-Lib Magazine*, vol. 11 (10). http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october05/ozek/10ozek.html

Eriksson, Jörgen (2005). More content in the institutional repository. *ScieCom Info,* vol. 2 (1) http://www.sciecom.org/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/26

Foster, Nancy Fried & Gibbons, Susan (2005). Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories. *D-Lib Magazine*, vol. 11(1), pp. 98-123. http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html

Grundmann, Amanda (2009). Increasing Self-Archiving of Faculty Publications in Institutional Repositories. *Open and Libraries Class Journal*, vol. 1(2).

Salo, Dorothea (2008). Innkeeper at the Roach Motel. *Library Trends*, vol. 57(2).

Additional information:

Lund Medical Faculty Monthly (LMFM): http://www.lmfm.med.lu.se/

Lund University Publications (LUP): http://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/research-and-innovation/find-publications

Yvonne Hultman Özek
Senior Librarian at Library and ICT-services – UMAS, Lund University

Aprile Clark
Librarian at Library and ICT-services – UMAS, Lund University